

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

1B

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/510,937	02/22/00	CAMPBELL	C MP/556

HM12/0705

Wayne D House  
W L Gore & Associates Inc  
551 Paper Mill Road  
P O Box 9206  
Newark DE 19714-9206

**EXAMINER**

MOHAMED, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1653	2

**DATE MAILED:** 07/05/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks****BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/510,937	Applicant(s)	CAMPBELL ET AL
Examiner	MOHAMED	Group Art Unit	163

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE -3- MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

### Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/22/00
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on 2/22/00 is  approved  disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
- received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

### Attachment(s)

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 (1 page)  Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948  Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1653

**DETAILED ACTION**

**APPLICATION LOCATION**

1. The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1653.

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF COMMUNICATION AND STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

2. The communication filed in regard to request for deletion of inventors under 37 C.F.R. 1.63(D)(2) filed 2/22/00 is acknowledged. Claims 1-9 are present for examination.

**HEADING FOR NONSTATUTORY DOUBLE PATENTING**

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 1653

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

#### **DOUBLE PATENTING, NON-STATUTORY WITH PATENTS**

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-22, 1-40 and 1-2, respectively of U. S. Patent Nos. 6,027,779, 6,025,044 and 6,027,811, respectively since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patents.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patents and is covered by the patents since the patents and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: The instantly claimed invention and the patents teach a PTFE tube with specific architecture and structure in which a thin-wall may be used in a non-porous embodiment as the balloon portion of a balloon catheter (See e.g., col. 9, lines 7-16; col. lines 57 to col. 10, lines 5; Figures 16A and 16B and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,027,779)..

Art Unit: 1653

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

#### **CLAIMS REJECTION-35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Buck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,925,710).

The independent claim 1 is drawn to a non-porous catheter balloon comprising porous polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) and a non-porous coating. The dependent claims 2-3 and 8-9 are drawn to particularly to non-porous coating comprising fluorinated ethylene propylene (claim 2), multiple layers of porous PTFE (claim 8), continuous coating (claim 9), and an adhesive (claim 3), wherein the adhesive comprises a thermoplastic adhesive (claim 4), and wherein the thermoplastic adhesive is a thermoplastic fluoropolymer (claim 5).

Art Unit: 1653

Buck et al. disclose a thin-wall non-porous tube comprising porous PTFE and a non-porous coating comprising polymers such as fluorinated ethylene propylene and commercially available thermoplastic adhesives such as thermoplastic fluoropolymers (See e.g., col. 2, lines 49 to col 3, lines 46). Although, on column 7, lines 10 to 13, the reference states that the nature or number of the layers in the outer sheath of the multilayered tube is not critical and can be selected as desired for the particular application contemplated. Nevertheless, the reference clearly discloses the use of non-porous coating comprising multiple layers of porous PTFE as well as the employment of a continuous coating (See e.g. abstract, Example , claims 1 and 16).

The reference does not disclose the intended use of the PTFE tube as "a catheter balloon" Nevertheless, a statement of usefulness or contemplated use of a claimed compound or composition in a claim is usually given little weight in distinguishing over the prior art. In re Maeder et al. (CCPA 1964) 337 F2d 875, 143 USPQ 248; In re Riden et al. (CCPA 1963) 318 F2d 761, 138 USPQ 112; In re Sinex (CCPA 1962) 309 F2d 488, 135 USPQ 302. Thus, in the absence of evidence to the contrary or specific structural limitations, the claimed PTFE tube disclosed by the reference anticipates claims 1-5 and 8-9 as drafted.

#### **CLAIMS REJECTION-35 U.S.C. 103**

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1653

(a) a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,925,710) in view of Gore (U.S. Patent No. 3,953,566) and Soltesz (U.S. Patent No. 5,254,107).

The patent of Buck et al. has been discussed under the rejections of 102(b) above with respect to the disclosure of a thin-wall non-porous tube comprising porous PTFE and a non-porous coating comprising polymers such as fluorinated ethylene propylene and commercially available thermoplastic adhesives such as thermoplastic fluoropolymers and the use of non-porous coating comprising multiple layers of porous PTFE as well as the employment of a continuous coating.

Art Unit: 1653

The patent of Buck et al. differs particularly from claims 6-7 in failing to teach the use of a porous PTFE tube comprising a porous expanded PTFE and wherein the balloon is an inelastic balloon. However, the reference of Gore 566' teaches the process for producing porous products of all kinds of shaped articles such as tubes and sheet films of porous expanded PTFE, wherein the PTFE has a microstructure of nodes interconnected by fibrils (See the entire document and particularly the abstract and claims). Further, the patent of Soltesz 107' the construction of catheter tube having a middle layer of wire reinforcement which is enclosed by inner and outer layers which are described as being tubular thermoplastic sections. Thus, the resulting catheter corresponding to the first and second catheter sections exhibits different properties in a manner corresponding to the different properties of thermoplastic materials used (See e.g., col. 3, lines 3-16). Further, on col. 3, lines 40 to 43, the reference clearly states that the inner tubular plastic layer may be made of PTFE or the like. Hence, clearly showing the use of PTFE and thermoplastic material in the construction of catheter tube.

With respect to the structure of the balloon to be an inelastic balloon, although, the prior art does not teach the use or construction of balloon *per se*, however, the prior art clearly teach the use or construction of thin-wall tube comprising porous PTFE and a non-porous coating, and as such, it would be conventional and within the ordinary skill in the art to which this invention pertains to expect the tube to be inelastic because the prior art used the same material/composition under substantially the same situation to make the thin-wall catheter tube as the instant claimed thin-wall catheter balloon. Therefore, in the absence of sufficient objective

Art Unit: 1653

factual evidence or unexpected results to the contrary, it would have been obvious to expect the tube of the prior art to be inelastic tube because of the reasonable expectation of the functional equivalency of the non-porous coating material.

### **CONCLUSION AND FUTURE CORRESPONDENCE**

7. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdel A. Mohamed whose telephone number is (703) 308-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 5:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached on (703) 308-2923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

*Christopher S. F. Low*

CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

*AM* Mohamed/AAM

June 29, 2000